

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/067,753	02/08/2002	Aaron Bratslavsky	01873.000049.	9310	
5514	7590 05/05/2004		EXAMINER		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			HO, ALLEN C		
30 ROCKEFE NEW YORK,	ELLER PLAZA		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW TORK,	141 10112		2882		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/067,753	BRATSLAVSKY ET	AL.		
7 7	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Allen C. Ho	2882			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 16 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the second	cation. A proper report can be called a	ply to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dar have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S 136(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate extens of the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal				
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require furth		see NOTE below):			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be		,000 110 12 20.01.7,			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment		
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w	· · ·		and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	· · · · · ·			
10. Other:		VARD J. GLICK RY PATENT EXAMI	NER		

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/067,753

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the invention possesses several characteristics not taught by Brooks. With regard to when the holder is bonded and who bonds the holder, these arguments fail to overcome the teachings of Brooks. As for how the holder is bonded, the examiner argues that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a removable adhesive since a person would be motivated to remove the holder from an electronic image sensor after use as the electronic image sensor is not a one-use device.